

Remarks

I. Administrative Overview

Claims 1-33 were presented for examination. Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 12-16 have been amended, and Claims 5 and 26-33 have been cancelled. Upon entry of these amendments, Claims 1-4 and 6-25 are pending. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the claims as previously presented.

II. Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Lemma for taking the time to interview with the Applicant's representative and for providing the interview summary for the interview. A Representative for the Applicant interviewed the Examiner, via the telephone, on March 12, 2009 at 1 PM EDT. During the interview, Applicant's representative presented a proposed set of claim amendments and Examiner Lemma noted that it appeared that the proposed claim amendments would overcome the cited art but that Examiner Lemma would conduct a further review of the art.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over publication, IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin titled "Administrative Role Configuration with Control Lists" TDB-ACC-NO: NB9112110 ("**IBM**") in view of U.S. Publication Number 2003/0046584 A1 to Laksono ("Laksono"). Claims 5 and 26-33 have been cancelled thereby mooted the rejection with respect to those claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-4 and 6-25 as previously presented are patentable over **IBM** in view of Laksono. Nevertheless, Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 12-16 have been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-4 and 6-25, as amended, are patentable over any combination of **IBM** and Laksono.

A claimed invention is obvious when one or more references, alone or together, teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that any combination of **IBM** and Laksono fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the

claimed invention because **IBM** and Laksono fail to teach or suggest determining “a minimal set of computing privileges necessary for the user to use the requested application based in part on an analysis of application requirements,” as required by each independent claim.

IBM describes a system for defining administrative roles within a UNIX system which allows any user to execute a particular command, but which also provides some users with additional privileges when executing that particular command. *See IBM*, p. 4. The system described by **IBM** accomplishes this by associating privileges “directly with the program file” and according to a privilege control list mechanism. *See IBM* p. 3-4. The privilege control list mechanism described in **IBM** does out privileges according to a privilege control list, not according to an analysis of application requirements. Thus, **IBM** does not teach or suggest determining “a minimal set of computing privileges necessary for the user to use the requested application based in part on an analysis of application requirements,” and so does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Laksono describes preventing users from controlling a media device in the absence of authentication of a hand held device using “the identity of the hand held device and/or its password.” *See Laksono*, p. 4 paragraph 40. At no point does Laksono teach or suggest determining a user’s privileges or a user’s ability to control the media device, based in part on an analysis of application requirements. Thus, Laksono, like **IBM**, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

In light of the above remarks, Claims 1 and 15 are patentable over any combination of **IBM** and Laksono. Claims 2-4, 6-14 and 16-25 depend on Claims 1 and 15, therefore, Claims 2-4, 6-14 and 16-25 are also patentable over any combination of **IBM** and Laksono. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

IV. Conclusion

Applicant contends that the Examiner's rejections are adequately addressed by the above-made remarks and that all of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's agent would expedite prosecution of this application; the Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's agent at the particulars identified below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP

Date: April 17, 2009

/Kellan D. Ponikiewicz/
Kellan D. Ponikiewicz
Registration Number: 59,701

Patent Group
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 502-5002